



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,890	03/23/2004	Allan Havemose	P1639US01	2390
32709	7590	03/09/2009		
GATEWAY, INC. ATTN: PATENT ATTORNEY 610 GATEWAY DRIVE N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049			EXAMINER TO, JENNIFER N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/09/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/806,890

**Applicant(s)**

HAVEMOSE, ALLAN

**Examiner**

JENNIFER N. TO

**Art Unit**

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending for examination.

#### ***Double Patenting***

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thornton*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-27 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6832377.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both computer systems comprise substantially the same elements. For example, claims 1-26, functions performed by the steps are the same and obvious as the steps of claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6832377.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 8-18, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 8, 12, and 15 recited the limitation of "wherein the registration information is provided to the first resource from a registration dynamic object before both said

accessing of the first resource and said accessing of the second resource". However, the recited limitation did not describe or support in the specification. For example, the specification pages 13, paragraph [0032] disclosed that in response to the request for accessing from the user, the user being universally registered, obtaining registration information for the resource from a registration dynamic object, and then allowing the user to access the contents of the resource. However, there is no where in the specification disclose that wherein the registration information is provided to the first resource from a registration dynamic object before both said accessing of the first resource and said accessing of the second resource. Therefore, claims 8, 12, and 15 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, and 21-24 are rejected for incorporating the above errors from their respective parent claims by dependency.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 8-18, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 8, lines 15-17 it is not clearly understood what is meant by "wherein the registration information is provided to the first resource from a registration dynamic

object before both said accessing of the first resource and said accessing of the second resource" (i.e. the recited is contradicted with lines 2-15).

As per claims 12 and 15, they have the same deficiency as claim 8 above.

Appropriate correction is required.

As per claims 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, and 21-24, they are rejected for incorporating the above errors from their respective parent claims by dependency.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over hyperDRIVE: Leveraging LDAP to Implement RBAC on the Web" by BARTZ.

10. BARZT was cited in the previous office action.

11. As to claims 12 and 13, BARTZ teaches the invention substantially as claim including a system for universal registration comprising:

a digital information server for sending a registration interface dynamic base object (authenticated distinguished name reference to the LDAP directory object) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second columns; in particular item 1);

a universal register (LDAP server) for hosting a registration implementation dynamic base object (role objects), the registration implementation dynamic base object corresponding to the registration interface dynamic base object (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column, in particular item 9);

a plurality of resources (servers), communicatively coupled to the digital information server and the universal register via a network, requiring user registration (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column); and

wherein in response to using the registration implementation dynamic base object (role objects) to provide user registration information, a user of the digital information server gains access to contents of any of said plurality of resources (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column); wherein said user registration information is stored in the universal register prior to seeking access to any of the plurality of resources (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column, the user pre-registration information is stored in LDAP directory).

12. BARTZ does not teach that the network is an information appliance network. However, Bartz disclosed his system is an n-tiered internet computing (abstract line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that appliance network is well known in the art, and since BARTZ teaches that the invention is implemented in Java for its "write once, run anywhere" quality it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the invention is applicable to an information appliance network since the code can run anywhere.

13. As to claim 14, BARTZ teaches the registration information includes a name (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that in order to authenticate with a server, the client has to send its name.

14. Claims 1-11, and 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over hyperDRIVE: Leveraging LDAP to Implement RBAC on the Web" by BARTZ, and in view of OLIVER et al (hereafter OLIVER) (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0133412).

15. BARZT and OLIVER were cited in the previous office action.



16. As to claim 1, BARTZ teaches the invention substantially as claim including a method for providing universal registration, comprising:

providing user registration information of a user to a universal registration resource (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column), the user registration information (distinguished name / user authentication information) accessible by providers of resources (via the business data services verify that the user is authorized to run the service by communicating with the LDAP server to get the user's authentication information) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column); and

requesting use of a first provider resource which requires the user registration information, wherein the provider resource automatically retrieves the user registration information from the universal registration resource to enable the user to access the first provider resource (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

17. BARTZ does not teach that the network is an information appliance network. Official Notice is taken in that such a network is well known in the art, and since BARTZ teaches that the invention is implemented in Java for its "write once, run anywhere"

quality it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the invention is applicable to an information appliance network since the code can run anywhere.

18. BARTZ did not specifically teach requesting use of second provider resource which requires the user registration information, wherein the provider resource automatically retrieves the user registration information from the universal registration resource to enable the user to access the second provider resource.

19. However, OLIVER teaches requesting use of second provider resource which requires the user registration information, wherein the provider resource automatically retrieves the user registration information from the universal registration resource to enable the user to access the second provider resource (abstract; paragraphs [0377]).

20. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of BARTZ and OLIVER because both of the system providing a universal registration information for the resource providers to look up in response to a request to access the resource providers. In addition, OLIVER teaching of requesting use of second provider resource which requires the user registration information, wherein the provider resource automatically retrieves the user registration information from the universal registration resource to enable the user to access the second provider resource would improved the integrity of BARTZ's system by providing a system which includes a verification means adapted to

allow each provider verify that the client/user's privilege before granting the access (OLIVER, paragraph [0012]).

21. As to claims 2-6, BARTZ teaches the user registration information is contained in a program object (via the role objects / DN (object describing people) being stored in the LDAP server which is a directory (see pg 70, Behavioral Summary and pg. 72 first and second columns). The cited reference does not detail that the name or object is in a string naming convention, however, Official Notice is taken in that object names, distinguished names are in a string naming convention that details the location of the object, the object name, and a method of the object and therefore it would be obvious that the distinguished names or other authentication information provided is in this format to be compared with the business services retrieved authentication information for the user to see if the user is permitted to access the service.

22. As to claim 7, BARTZ teaches the registration information includes a name (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column). It is inherent that in order to authenticate with a server, the client has to send its name.

23. As to claim 8, BARTZ teaches the invention substantially as claim including a method for accessing contents of a multiple resource (invoking multiple business services) by a user (client), comprising:

accessing a first resource which requires registration by the user (via the business data services verify that the user is authorized to run the service by communicating with the LDAP server to get the user's authentication information) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column);

in response to said first resource supporting universal registration and the user being universally registered, obtaining registration information for the first resource from a registration dynamic object (LDAP server / directory server) (via the business data services verify that the user is authorized to run the service by communicating with the LDAP server to get the user's authentication information) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column); and

allowing the user to access contents of said first resource in response to obtaining said registration information for the first resource; wherein the registration information is provided to the first resource from a registration object before both said accessing of the first resource and said accessing of the second resource (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

24. BARTZ did not specifically teach accessing a second resource which requires registration by the user, in response to said second resource supporting universal registration and said user being universally registered, obtaining registration information

for the second resource from the registration dynamic object, and allowing said user to access contents of said second resource in response to obtaining said registration information for the second resource (abstract; paragraphs [0364], [0377]-[0383]).

25. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of BARTZ and OLIVER because both of the system providing a universal registration information for the resource providers to look up in response to a request to access the resource providers. In addition, OLIVER teaching of accessing a second resource which requires registration by the user, in response to said second resource supporting universal registration and said user being universally registered, obtaining registration information for the second resource from the registration dynamic object, and allowing said user to access contents of said second resource in response to obtaining said registration information for the second resource would improved the integrity of BARTZ's system by providing a system which includes a verification means adapted to allow each provider verify that the client/user's privilege before granting the access (OLIVER, paragraph [0012]).

26. As to claim 9, BARTZ teaches when the first resource fails to support universal registration and the user utilizes a registration dynamic base object, registering the user by the registration dynamic base object per pre-registered user data (via the user sends its distinguished name to the business service such that it verifies the user has access by comparing it to the one stored on the LDAP server wherein the act of authorization

and authentication are separate activities, thus they occur at different times, SEE PG. 70, 4th – 6th paragraphs). The cited teachings of BARTZ, inherently teach allowing the registration to occur after the requesting access and dynamically change how the resources are protected (pg. 70, second column, behavioral summary).

27. As to claim 10, BARTZ teaches when the first resource supports universal registration and the user is not universally registered, entering registration information by the user (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

28. As to claim 11, BARTZ teaches the registration information includes a name (via the web client authenticating with the web server / LDAP server in order access various business services) (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column). It is inherent that in order to authenticate with a server, the client has to send its.

29. As to claims 15-18, reference is made to a computer readable medium that corresponds to the method of claims 8-11 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 8-11 above.

30. As per claim 19, OLIVER teaches determining that the provider resource does not have said user registration information (abstract).

31. As per claim 20, OLIVER teaches that wherein the requesting use of the provider resource is a first time request for the use of the provider resource (abstract; paragraph [0367]).

32. As per claims 21-22, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 19-20 above.

33. As per claims 23-24, BARTZ teaches the invention substantially as claim in claim 12 above. BARTZ did not specifically teach determining that the provider resource does not have said user registration information, and wherein the requesting use of the provider resource is a first time request for the use of the provider resource.

34. However, OLIVER teaches determining that the provider resource does not have said user registration information, and wherein the requesting use of the provider resource is a first time request for the use of the provider resource (abstract; paragraph [0367]).

35. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of BARTZ and OLIVER because both of the system providing a universal registration information for the resource providers to look up in response to a request to access the resource providers. In addition, OLIVER teaching of determining that the provider resource does not have said

user registration information, and wherein the requesting use of the provider resource is a first time request for the use of the provider resource would improved the integrity of BARTZ's system by providing a system which includes a verification means adapted to allow each provider verify that the client/user's privilege before granting the access (OLIVER, paragraph [0012]).

36. As per claims 25-27, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 8 above.

***Response to Arguments***

37. Applicant's arguments filed 12/23/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

38. In the remark applicant argued that (1) Bartz fails to teach registration information and requiring user registration, (2) obtaining registration information for the resource from a registration dynamic object, and (3) the terminal disclaimer filed 04/25/2008 overcome the obvious type double patenting rejection with respect to claims 1-27.

39. Examiner respectful disagreed with applicant argument.

As to point (1), Bartz teaches registration information and requiring (see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column, via the web, client authenticating with the web server, using distinguished name / user authentication information);



As to point (2), Bartz teaches obtaining registration information for the resource from a registration dynamic object (via through the hyperDRIVE Guide applet, the customer invokes an operation such that the web server uses its ORB to contact the LDAP server to determine whether the customer's authenticated identified (distinguished name) matches the one provided to allow the user to use the resource, see fig. 2; pg. 72 first and second column).

As to point (3), the terminal disclaimer filed 04/25/2008 had not overcome the obvious type double patenting rejection with respect to claims 1-26 because the terminal disclaimer is not approved since the attorney signed the terminal disclaimer is not on record.

### ***Conclusion***

40. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

41. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER N. TO whose telephone number is (571)272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6AM- 3:30 PM, F 6AM- 2:30 PM.

42. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

43. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

Jennifer To  
Patent Examiner  
AU 2195

